

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

GREGORY GRAHAM,)	
# 193214,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Case No. 1:16-cv-149
)	
v.)	Honorable Robert J. Jonker
)	
DOUGLAS MURLAND,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

This is a civil rights action brought *pro se* by a state prisoner under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff is an inmate at the Bellamy Creek Correctional Facility. On July 25, 2014, plaintiff was an inmate at the Oaks Correctional Facility (ECF). The defendant, Corrections Officer Douglas Murtland, is employed at ECF by the Michigan Department of Corrections. On July 25, 2014, plaintiff was involved in a fight with prisoner Butler. Plaintiff alleges that, when defendant intervened, he used excessive force against plaintiff in violation of his rights under the Eighth Amendments Cruel and Unusual Punishments Clause.¹ Plaintiff sues defendant in his individual and official capacities and seeks an award of damages. (ECF No. 1 at PageID.1, 3).

¹All other claims have been dismissed. (ECF No. 7, 8).

The matter is now before me on defendant's motion for summary judgment based on the affirmative defense provided by 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a). (ECF No. 19). Plaintiff has elected not to file a response. For the reasons set forth herein, I recommend that plaintiff's claim for damages against defendant in his official capacity be dismissed with prejudice because it is barred by Eleventh Amendment immunity. I recommend that defendant's motion for summary judgment on plaintiff's claims for damages against him in his individual capacity be denied because defendant did not carry his burden on the affirmative defense.

Summary Judgment Standard

Summary judgment is appropriate when the record reveals that there are no genuine issues as to any material fact in dispute and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. FED. R. CIV. P. 56(a); *McKay v. Federspiel*, 823 F.3d 862, 866 (6th Cir. 2016). The standard for determining whether summary judgment is appropriate is "whether 'the evidence presents a sufficient disagreement to require submission to a jury or whether it is so one-sided that one party must prevail as a matter of law.'" *Rocheleau v. Elder Living Const., LLC*, 814 F.3d 398, 400 (6th Cir. 2016) (quoting *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 251-52 (1986)). The Court must consider all pleadings, depositions, affidavits, and admissions on file, and draw all justifiable inferences in favor of the party opposing the motion. *See Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 587 (1986); *France v. Lucas*, 836 F.3d 612, 624 (6th Cir. 2016).

When the party without the burden of proof seeks summary judgment, that party bears the initial burden of pointing out to the district court an absence of evidence to support the nonmoving party's case, but need not support its motion with affidavits or other materials "negating" the opponent's claim. *See Morris v. Oldham County Fiscal Court*, 201 F.3d 784, 787 (6th Cir. 2000); *see also Minadeo v. ICI Paints*, 398 F.3d 751, 761 (6th Cir. 2005). Once the movant shows that "there is an absence of evidence to support the nonmoving party's case," the nonmoving party has the burden of coming forward with evidence raising a triable issue of fact. *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 323 (1986). To sustain this burden, the nonmoving party may not rest on the mere allegations of his pleadings. *See Ellington v. City of E. Cleveland*, 689 F.3d 549, 552 (6th Cir. 2012); *see also Scadden v. Werner*, 677 F. App'x 996, 1001 (6th Cir. Jan. 27, 2017). The motion for summary judgment forces the nonmoving party to present evidence sufficient to create a genuine issue of fact for trial. *Street v. J.C. Bradford & Co.*, 886 F.2d 1472, 1478 (6th Cir. 1990); *see Newell Rubbermaid, Inc. v. Raymond Corp.*, 676 F.3d 521, 533 (6th Cir. 2012). "A mere scintilla of evidence is insufficient; 'there must be evidence on which a jury could reasonably find for the [non-movant].'" *Dominguez v. Correctional Med. Servs.*, 555 F.3d 543, 549 (6th Cir. 2009) (quoting *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 252); *see Brown v. Battle Creek Police Dep't*, 844 F.3d 556, 565 (6th Cir. 2016).

A moving party with the burden of proof faces a “substantially higher hurdle.” *Arnett v. Myers*, 281 F.3d 552, 561 (6th Cir. 2002); *Cockrel v. Shelby County Sch. Dist.*, 270 F.3d 1036, 1056 (6th Cir. 2001). The moving party without the burden of proof needs only show that the opponent cannot sustain his burden at trial. “But where the moving party has the burden - the plaintiff on a claim for relief or the defendant on an affirmative defense - his showing must be sufficient for the court to hold that no reasonable trier of fact could find other than for the moving party.” *Calderone v. United States*, 799 F.2d 254, 259 (6th Cir. 1986) (citation and quotation omitted). The Court of Appeals has repeatedly emphasized that the party with the burden of proof faces “a substantially higher hurdle” and “‘must show that the record contains evidence satisfying the burden of persuasion and that the evidence is so powerful that no reasonable jury would be free to disbelieve it.’” *Arnett*, 281 F.3d at 561 (quoting 11 JAMES WILLIAM MOORE, ET AL., MOORE’S FEDERAL PRACTICE § 56.13[1], at 56-138 (3d ed. 2000)); see *Surles v. Andison*, 678 F.3d 452, 455-56 (6th Cir. 2012); *Cockrel*, 270 F.2d at 1056. Accordingly, summary judgment in favor of the party with the burden of persuasion “is inappropriate when the evidence is susceptible of different interpretations or inferences by the trier of fact.” *Hunt v. Cromartie*, 526 U.S. 541, 553 (1999).

The Affirmative Defense of Failure to Exhaust Remedies Standards

Defendant has asserted the affirmative defense of plaintiff's failure to exhaust administrative remedies. A prisoner bringing an action with respect to prison conditions under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 "or any other Federal law" must exhaust available administrative remedies. 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a); see *Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. 199, 220 (2007); *Porter v. Nussle*, 534 U.S. 516, 532 (2002); *Booth v. Churner*, 532 U.S. 731 (2001). A prisoner must exhaust available administrative remedies, even if the prisoner may not be able to obtain the specific type of relief he seeks in the state administrative process. See *Porter*, 534 U.S. at 520; *Booth*, 532 U.S. at 734. "This requirement is a strong one. To further the purposes behind the PLRA, exhaustion is required even if the prisoner subjectively believes the remedy is not available, even when the state cannot grant the particular relief requested, and even where the prisoner[] believes the procedure to be ineffectual or futile." *Napier v. Laurel County, Ky.*, 636 F.3d 218, 222 (6th Cir. 2011) (internal quotations and citations omitted).

In *Jones v. Bock*, the Supreme Court held that "exhaustion is an affirmative defense, and prisoners are not required to specifically plead or demonstrate exhaustion in their complaints." 549 U.S. at 216. The burden is on defendant to show that plaintiff failed to properly exhaust his administrative remedies. The Supreme Court reiterated that "no unexhausted claim may be considered." 549 U.S. at 220.

In order to exhaust administrative remedies, prisoners must complete the administrative review process in accordance with the deadlines and other applicable procedural rules established by state law. *Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. at 218-19. In *Woodford v. Ngo*, 548 U.S. 81 (2006), the Supreme Court held that the PLRA exhaustion requirement “requires proper exhaustion.” 548 U.S. at 93. “Proper exhaustion demands compliance with an agency’s deadlines and other critical procedural rules.” *Id.* at 90; *see Scott v. Ambani*, 577 F.3d 642, 647 (6th Cir. 2009). Thus, when a prisoner’s grievance is rejected by the prison as untimely because it was not filed within the prescribed period, the prisoner’s claim is not “properly exhausted” for purposes of filing a section 1983 action in federal court. 548 U.S. at 90-93; *Siggers v. Campbell*, 652 F.3d 681, 692 (6th Cir. 2011); *see* 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a).

MDOC Policy Directive 03.02.130 (effective July 9, 2007) sets forth the applicable grievance procedures.² The Sixth Circuit has “clearly held that an inmate does not exhaust available administrative remedies when the inmate fails entirely to invoke the grievance procedure.” *Napier*, 636 F.3d at 224. An argument that it would have been futile to file a grievance does not suffice. Assertions of futility do not excuse plaintiff from the exhaustion requirement. *See Napier*, 636 F.3d at 224; *Hartsfield v. Vidor*, 199 F.3d 305, 309 (6th Cir. 1999) (“[A]n inmate cannot simply fail to file a grievance or abandon the process before completion and claim that he has

²A copy of the policy directive is found in the record. *See* ECF No. 20 at PageID.137-43.

exhausted his remedies or that it is futile for him to do so because his grievance is now time-barred under the regulations.”); see *Booth v. Churner*, 532 U.S. at 741 n.6 (“[W]e will not read futility or other exceptions into statutory exhaustion requirements where Congress has provided otherwise.”).

Proposed Findings of Fact

The following facts are beyond genuine issue. Plaintiff is an inmate held in the custody of the Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC) on criminal convictions. He is currently an inmate at the Bellamy Creek Correctional Facility.

On July 25, 2014, plaintiff was an inmate at the Oaks Correctional Facility (ECF). On that date, plaintiff was involved in an altercation with prisoner Butler. Corrections Officer Douglas Murtland was involved in breaking up the fight and in the process he used a taser against plaintiff.

Plaintiff filed a grievance in which he alleged that defendant’s use of a taser was “excessive force.” (ECF No. 20-2, at PageID.150). Plaintiff pursued his grievance through Step III of MDOC’s grievance process. (*Id.* at PageID.147-50) PageID.150) The Step II grievance appeal response included a sentence stating that the excessive force claim stemming from defendant’s taser use was a “new issue” that defendant had raised for the first time in his Step II appeal. (*Id.* at PageID.149).

Discussion

I. Eleventh Amendment

Plaintiff's claim for damages against defendant in his official capacity is barred by Eleventh Amendment immunity. The Eleventh Amendment bars suit in federal court against a state and its departments or agencies unless the state has waived its sovereign immunity or unequivocally consented to be sued. *See Pennhurst State Sch. & Hosp. v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. 89, 100 (1984). Michigan has not consented to civil rights suits in federal court. *See Johnson v. Dellatiffa*, 357 F.3d 539, 545 (6th Cir. 2004). A suit against a state officer in his or her official capacity is simply another way of pleading an action against the state. *See Will v. Michigan Dep't of State Police*, 491 U.S. 58, 71 (1989); *VIBO Corp. v. Conway*, 669 F.3d 675, 691 (6th Cir. 2012). Furthermore, states and their departments are not "persons" within the meaning of 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *See Will v. Michigan Dep't of State Police*, 491 U.S. at 71. Defendant is entitled to dismissal with prejudice of plaintiff's claim under section 1983 for monetary damages against him in his official capacity.

II. Summary Judgment

Defendant has raised the affirmative defense that plaintiff did not properly exhaust his administrative remedies against him as required by 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a). Exhaustion is mandatory. *Woodford*, 548 U.S. at 85. "[N]o unexhausted claim may be considered." *Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. at 220.

Defendant argues that plaintiff's Step I grievance did not raise the excessive force claim against defendant. (Defendant's Brief at 8, ECF No. 20, PageID.134). I find that defendant's argument is untenable given that the claim is clearly stated on the face of the grievance. (ECF No. 20-2 at PageID.150).

Defendant also argues that plaintiff identified the date of the incident as August 29, 2014, rather than July 25, 2014. (Defendant's Brief at 6-7, ECF No. 20, PageID.132-33). The date is handwritten and subject to interpretation. A comparison of the numbers found in the "Date of the Incident" box and other numbers on the face of plaintiff's grievance provides strong support for "August 25, 2014," being listed as the "Date of the Incident." (ECF No. 20-2, PageID.150). Plaintiff could have easily made a mistake in listing the eighth month rather than the seventh month of the year. There is nothing before the Court indicating that defendant used a taser against plaintiff on both July 25, 2014, and August 25, 2014. In any event, plaintiff's grievance was not rejected as untimely. A procedural bar does not apply where the State declines to enforce its own procedural rules. *See Reed-Bey v. Pramstaller*, 603 F.3d 322, 324-25 (6th Cir. 2010).

I find that defendant has not carried his burden of proof on the affirmative defense.

Recommended Disposition

For the foregoing reasons, I recommend that plaintiff's claim for damages against defendant in his official capacity be dismissed with prejudice because it is

barred by Eleventh Amendment immunity. I recommend that defendant's motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 19) be denied on plaintiff's claim for damages against defendant in his individual capacity.

Dated: November 5, 2017

/s/ Phillip J. Green

PHILLIP J. GREEN

United States Magistrate Judge

NOTICE TO PARTIES

ANY OBJECTIONS to this Report and Recommendation must be filed and served within fourteen days of service of this notice on you. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b). All objections and responses to objections are governed by W.D. MICH. LCIVR 72.3(b). Failure to file timely and specific objections may constitute a waiver of any further right of appeal. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Keeling v. Warden, Lebanon Corr. Inst.*, 673 F.3d 452, 458 (6th Cir. 2012); *United States v. Branch*, 537 F.3d 582, 587 (6th Cir. 2008). General objections do not suffice. See *McClanahan v. Comm'r of Social Security*, 474 F.3d 830, 837 (6th Cir. 2006); *Frontier Ins. Co. v. Blaty*, 454 F.3d 590, 596-97 (6th Cir. 2006).